DATE: July 23, 2001
NOTE TO: Distribution
FROM: Rick Serbu, Manager
DOE Technical Standards Program
US Department of Energy
SUBJECT: **MEETING MINUTES**
COORDINATION MEETING - DOE, NRC AND
STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS

On Wednesday, June 27, 2001, the Department of Energy (DOE) and Nuclear Regulatory Commission Standards Executives cosponsored a meeting with U.S. Standards Development Organizations (SDOs) to review the status of joint DOE/NRC/SDO standards activities and identify issues and activities for future coordination. The meeting was held from 1:00 P.M. til 5:00 PM at the USDOE Forrestal Building, Room GH-027. About 25 DOE, NRC, and SDO representatives attended. An attendance list (Attachment 1) and the meeting agenda (Attachment 2) are attached. Rick Serbu, the DOE Technical Standards Program Manager, facilitated the meeting presentations and discussions. This summary of the coordination meeting activities and discussions is provided for your information. The minutes have been provided to and reviewed by principal participants at the meeting, and their comments and revisions are incorporated in this final version of the minutes. The minutes and the 9 Attachments referenced in the minutes (about 845 KB in PDF, Word, Word Perfect, Power Point, Lotus Notes) will be included with the electronic E-mail distribution of the minutes.

1. Opening remarks were provided by Mr. Richard L. Black, DOE Standards Executive, and Michael Mayfield, NRC Standards Executive, reflecting the planned agenda and stated meeting goals.

2. Kitty Kono, speaking on behalf of Jeff Adkins of ASTM, outlined the ASTM administration of ISO TC85 on Nuclear Energy. A handout outlining the presentation is provided as Attachment 3. Much of the information on this and other ASTM activities is available at the ASTM Web Site (www.astm.org). Key points of Kitty's discussion and related comments include:

- ASTM initiated a pilot effort with ISO to process ASTM standards through ISO using ASTM processes, with approval via ISO Technical Committee and ISO recognition of these ASTM standards.

-ASTM has been pursuing recognition for ASTM (and U.S.) standards as equivalent international standards, but it has been a difficult path to follow. In many cases, ASTM participation and the use of ASTM standards by other countries has actually been broader and more international than ISO standards efforts.

- Under the ISO venue, European interests strongly outweigh U.S. interests - even though the U.S. economy comprises 20% of the world economy, we have only 1 vote under ISO compared to the 35 votes of the European block (John Ferguson, ASME).

- ASTM is serving as the administrator of TC85, but this does not preclude the active participation of other SDOs under this administration. We encourage and expect widespread participation of US SDOs in their areas of interest under TC85 (Rick Serbu).

- The NRC, DOE, and NIST perceived the value of continuing to support ISO TC85 for the near term, with the understanding of the need for industry involvement and a forthcoming strategy and takeover of such support (Mike Mayfield).

- Alex Marion (NEI) noted that the U.S. commercial power reactor industry is mature, with well-developed standards that need only modest, cyclical updates. Few "new" or significantly revised standards are needed or anticipated. There is value from industry participation with U.S. SDOs in supporting standards activities, and industry has been and will continue to be active in its support (e.g., to ANS, IEEE, ASME, ASTM, etc). Efforts to develop new ISO (international nuclear energy) standards do not provide similar value compared to working with US SDOs, thus industry is reluctant to support international ISO activities.

- Failure to participate with ISO leaves international nuclear energy standards development open to European interests with no US participation, and the specter of "backfits" and unnecessary, unwanted, and restrictive standards. If U.S. industry participates, they will at least have some say. Lack of participation precludes any U.S. influence whatsoever (Rick Serbu).

3. John Fredlund (DOE/DP-45) discussed DOE and Interagency needs for a Lighting Protection Standard and related NFPA 780 issues. Various government users have joined together and outlined needs and justifications for NFPA to maintain its lightning protection standard.

- John outlined issues surrounding NFPA's pending cancellation, and identified 3 areas where DOE and other agencies (e.g., DOE/Army, NASA) have needs in a lightning standard. He noted that the existing NFPA 780 standard addresses primarily structural protection, while personal protection, protection of building contents, and notification/warnings are not fully addressed. To address DOE needs, DOE plans to develop a lightning protection standard to meet safety needs. Copies of the presentation viewgraphs are provided as Attachment 4.

- Ambler Thompson of NIST noted that NIST has a Building and Fire Research Laboratory and that the NIST representatives should be contacted about any lightning standard development effort.

- Tony O'Neill of NFPA reiterated the circumstances surrounding the possible cancellation of NFPA 780. He noted the October 2001 notice of "Sunset" on NFPA 780, and the participation of DOD, NRC, NASA, and FAA in 780 activities, and that the NIST Building and Fire Research Lab had been invited to participate. Tony indicated that a major issue for continuing the use of NFPA 780 was a "restraint of trade" issue. This stems from proposed alternative competing standards (European, et al) promoting lightning protection standards different from the 780 approach, but offering no evidence of technical superiority over the time-tested 780 approaches (as concluded by the 780 technical working group). Proponents of these "alternative" standards have invoked standards process and legal means to block 780 and open the use of their

"alternatives" to the international market. Tony recognized the government agencies' needs related to NFPA 780, and applauded their surfacing of their issues and interests in participation. He stated that it is not acceptable to have a comprehensive lightning standard developed by a government agency - they should work through the appropriate SDO (i.e., NFPA).

- Dick Black (DOE) inquired as to precedents for other "restraint of trade" issues related to standards, and a limited number of cases were cited.

4. Neil W. Brown (DOE/LLNL) reviewed the status of the conversion of DOE seismic technical standards to voluntary consensus standards via ANS/ASCE sponsorship. Neil noted that the effort began in 1996 to convert four DOE natural phenomena hazard (NPH) standards, but that the scope proved far too wide to be readily handled. The working groups narrowed the effort to the seismic aspects of NPH, but significant effort has been needed to reach agreement on the DOE probabalistic approach, and concepts favored by the NRC and private sector interests. Much of the effort has been directed towards "improving" the provisions of the DOE standards, rather than in "converting" them to ANS/ASCE standards. Neil noted that when the process becomes long and drawn out, participants lose interest. Two of the converted standards, ASCE XXX, and ANS 2.26 are nearing completion, with a ballot due on ANS 2.26 on 12/01. Neil noted that a review process facilitated with a tool, such as that demonstrated by REVCOM later in the meeting, could help expedite the process. Attachment 5 lists the key points of Neil's presentation.

- Dick Black (DOE) asked if DOE would be able to use the standards when they were completed. Neil indicated that they would be useable, but only included the seismic aspects of NPH (wind, rain, snow, etc. not included), and thus were of limited use.

5. Stephen Domotor (DOE/EH-412) discussed the efforts and interactions of the DOE Biota Dose Assessment Topical Committee in DOE, Interagency, National and International Forums. This topical committee, working with EH-412 (the DOE sponsoring organization), has developed a DOE Technical Standard that provides "A Graded Approach for Evaluating Radiation Doses to Aquatic and Terrestrial Biota (DOE-TSP Project # ENVR-0011)." The Technical Standard is responsive to growing stakeholder and regulator interest in protection of natural resources from the potential effects of radiation in the environment. Steve's presentation provided a remarkable success story of a DOE Topical Committee working with other agencies and in international forums to promote interest and participation in standards development. An outline of Steve's presentation is provided as Attachment 6.

- Rick Serbu (DOE) noted that about 26 DOE Topical Committees have been charted in areas such as Fire Protection, Environmental Management Systems, and QA. These groups provide a principal means for DOE (and its contractor) subject matter experts to coordinate across DOE and with other agencies and especially with counterpart SDO groups on standards development activities. Incidentally, they provide a means for crosscutting technical groups to survive frequent reorganizations of government agencies.

- Dick Black asked if budget and personnel cuts had affected standards development and standards participation efforts. Discussion indicated that most participants believed that participation with SDOs had dropped, but it was proportional to budget and personnel cuts. Organizations still participated on the most important activities, but were more focused.

6. Ilir Angjeli (DOE/MA-4) provided a discussion and demonstration of DOE's REVCOM review and comments system. There was widespread interest among attendees in assessing the REVCOM system for standards development and comment resolution, due to its ease of use. Several post-meeting consultations were arranged. An outline of Ilir's presentation is provided as Attachment 7. Ilir can be contacted at 202-586-3282 or ilir.angjeli@hq.doe.gov.

7. John Flack (NRC, Office of Research) discussed the status of Advanced Reactors in the NRC review and licensing processes. Extensive discussion followed on when and how to pursue the development of supporting standards for advanced reactors, including the Pebble Bed Reactor. Attachment 8 provides details of John's presentation, "Standards Development Organizations Licensing and Regulatory Approaches for Advanced Reactors."

- John indicated that we could expect efforts to support Pebble Bed reactor standards by as soon as the end of next year (2002) in response to an inquiry.

- It was pointed out by several attendees that waiting "til the end" (i.e., when the standards are actually needed) to support standards development was not the forte of SDOs, since the reputation of standards bodies does not include a knack for speedy development cycles!

- Alex Marion (NEI) noted other considerations that presuppose a premature involvement in developing standards for "new" reactor designs. New standards need to incorporate risk-based considerations. We need to have a clear understanding of what the design issues are and what to focus on before proposing standards.. This entails waiting until significant technical development has been achieved on the Pebble Bed, Generation 4, Gas-Cooled, and IRIS. As far as the Advanced Light Water Reactors (GE ABWR, West. System 80+ and AP-600) are concerned, the designs have been certified by the NRC, so it’s not clear what additional benefit or value can be provided by standards development organizations.

- Interest in standards development and participation is strongest among the Chinese and the South African contingents, because of their advanced involvement in Pebble Bed technology (John Ferguson, ASME).

Bud Danielson (DOE/EH-53) questioned whether the standards community is appropriately organized and has the proper framework for coordinating standards work on as much as four different advanced reactor types.

- Alex Marion (NEI) further stated that industry will continue to provide support to standards development activities based on need - much as in the past and present. They will provide participation and overall coordination "at the right time", and be involved in all new designs, in conjunction with the NRC. NEI will continue a "codes and standards coordination role.". Alex

also stated another important point - that the regulatory process for new plant licensing and regulation should begin start "with a clean, white sheet of paper", i.e., not based on past regulatory practice, but one based on ensuring safety in new generations of reactor designs and the use of risk-insights.

- Don Spellman (ORNL/TSP/ANS) voiced support for Alex's remarks, and pointed out that some pertinent past standards development efforts [e.g., existing draft ANS standard on Gas Cooled Reactors, other ISO/IEC (German?) standards on high temperature reactors] that should be consulted before starting from scratch.

- John Fergusun (ASME) added that there needs to be a clear need for a standard, then the support will be forthcoming. He cited the development of PRA standards as an example. He also noted that the development of electronic development methods and balloting would help "speed up" the processes.

- Dick Black (DOE/EH-53) asked Neil Brown (DOE/LLNL) if there were reduced commitments and resources for standards activities as a result of budget cuts. Niel indicated that there was strong Lab support for key activities, but that some of the support was covered from Laboratory overhead. He again noted that people "wear out" when standards development activities extend over a long time.

- Don Spellman (ORNL/TSP/ANS) stated support for DOE topical committees as a means to keep agency standards development efforts focused.

- Ambler Thompson (NIST) stated that there was little support for the "leadership role" (in international standards development), and being "active". A question came up regarding what "active" means in this case.

- Kitty Kono (ASTM) stated that "active" means you participate in standards development, and participation seems to be declining in many areas.

- John Ferguson (ASME) recognized that participation in general at ASME is down based on the decrease from 4,000 writers supporting ASME in the past.

- Dick Black (DOE/EH-53) stated that we have to recognize that physical "aging" of the standards developers/participants is a major factor in lessen participation, particularly in the nuclear areas. Many "old timers" are either retiring or retired, and replacements either not available, not capable, or not adequately trained and experienced.

- Before proceeding with advanced reactor standards, we will need dedicated topical committees and begin to identify "what are the needs" (ANS/NEI).

- John Ferguson (ASME), supported "en masse" by meeting participants, noted that "codes and standards" are not taught at U.S. colleges and universities, and that this has helped create the shortage of qualified participants on agency and SDO standards bodies. Participation requires

knowledge and experience, and the outflow of "old timers" is not being replaced by qualified younger individuals.

8. Status of On-going SDO Efforts (SDO Representatives)

A "go-around" of meeting participants was conducted to identify needs and priorities, and address "ad hoc" issues from the meeting. SDO representatives were invited to discuss standards under development and to address emerging issues.

a. Gordon Riel, representing the Health Physics Society (HPS), discussed overall HPS standards activities, and provided a handout (Attachment 9) listing HPS standards and standards activities. Gordon noted that many ongoing efforts need more volunteers to be more effective. He encouraged participants to contact the HPS if any HPS standards are needed, as well as any support in meetings, publishing, or related standards support activities. Gordon indicated further interest in the DOE REVCOM system as a means to simplify and expedite reviews.

b. Bud Danielson (DOE/EH-53, ASME NQA Committee, US TAG ISO TC 176 (ISO 9001), ANSI International Conformity Assessment Committee)

Bud discussed resources supporting NQA and the US TAG supporting ISO 9001 activities. He questioned the availability of resources to support several simultaneous advanced reactor standards development efforts. Bud noted that there were SDO nuclear Quality Assurance (QA) groups that could coordinate or combine to optimize effort and save resources, (e.g., the ANS 3.1 group, ASME NQA 1).

- Alex Marion (NEI) supported the integration of the separate US SDO QA standards and standards development organizations into one US nuclear QA standards entity to reduce unnecessary duplication..

- Don Spellman (ORNL/ANS) suggested going with the NTAG as the focus, and Bud noted that the main functions needed to be nuclear oriented.

- John Ferguson (ASME) also voiced support for integration of nuclear QA functions.

Bud asked how receptive the international members of ISO TC 85 will be to recognizing U.S. SDO (ASTM) developed standards as international standards without the normal ISO standard development process applied. This has not been the case with TC 176. The European members are especially sensitive to any appearance of the U.S. dominating a standards action. Bud also asked if the U.S. NTAG to TC 85 was considering any quality standards action. He understood there is an agreement with the IAEA and ISO that gives nuclear QA standards scope to the IAEA. The ASME NQA-1 standard is also used internationally for nuclear QA applications.

c. Tony O'Neill (NFPA)
In addition to an earlier discussion of the status of the NFPA lightning protection standard, Tony reported on the publication of NFPA 805 after 3 1/2 years of development. An NFPA Building Code supplement to the Life Safety Code has also been developed. NFPA codes and standards can be accessed at NFPA.org where a new, more transparent format has been applied.

A further discussion ensued that related the decrease in federal participation with SDOs to the downsizing of the federal government. Decreases have basically been proportional to the decreases in the federal workforce. Tony viewed the NTTAA as a motivator for "Feds" to work with SDOs. There is value in participation in the standards development process for government agencies.

d. Kitty Kono (ASTM)
Kitty noted that the implementation of electronic standards development and balloting at ASTM is expected to help speed up the standards development process. ASTM also has a system of "Provisional Standards" that enables a standard to be used provisionally after the first level of balloting, rather than the full three levels of balloting required for full approval. The use of provisional standards has not caused any particular problems. Kitty noted that ASTM uses electronic standards development forms, but it requires a motivated, computer-savy user to participate and use such forms. The DOE REVCOM system is of interest because of its simplicity and ease-of-use. An on-line ASTM index is being used to build a new structure for following ASTM activities. It will include a searchable electronic list of new work items under ASTM, along with concurrent projects. ASTM is stressing global recruitment to reinforce its image as a "de facto" international standards body.

e. John Ferguson (ASME)
John reported that ASME is also developing an electronic standards processing system, like other SDOs. The DOE REVCOM system also is of interest because it seems easy to understand and use. John stressed that in dealing with standards development needs, it is important to work the right things - the things that are needed and will be used, and that planning is essential in successful standards projects. People, process, and products are the key considerations at ASME. ASME's interest in "internationalization" of standards recognizes several impacts: We probably can't write standards here (even with international participation) and hope they (e.g., the Europeans) adopt them there (e.g., the Common Market). We need to start a Code Committee (under ISO) to support our writing them through ISO. There are areas of the world that need support in standards development, and we should support their participation. For instance, the Chinese are interested in standards to support their experience with Pebble Bed reactors, and ASME hopes to work with a Chinese university to support this effort. ASME is also working to translate ASME Codes into Chinese. The internationalization of U.S. standards would probably not be accepted in Europe, but would be by developing countries. In other areas, the Japanese have shown interest in an international Nuclear Experimental Reactor standard. There are other technical issues under exploration that may result in standards, such as the Inconel 600 cracking problems, that may find their way into the ASME codes and standards. ASME has implemented a redesigned Code process (equivalent to the ANSI process, but faster) that has been used on the PRA standard (which is now out). The Risk area has become a focus

for new Code cases, feeding the concept of informed design. As far as "what's next", we will eventually need new or revised standards for the advanced design reactors. We also need to develop contacts for these future standards activities. John found the SDO Coordination Meeting both useful and informative.

f. Don Spellman (ANS)

We need to focus on what are our standards development needs, and define where we are headed (particularly for advanced reactors), and "back off" unnecessary and untimely standards development efforts. In ANS, the Nuclear Facilities Standards Committee is reorganizing and combining with N48 to include all nuclear facilities. A new and improved ANS web site is up and running. ANS is going to "on-line" comments. ANS has held strategy sessions with NEI, including how to "push" ANS as an SDO. A new committee on risk integration and risk-based standards has been set up by ANS. Performance-based criteria have been reviewed with the NRC, and criteria developed for writing performance-based standards. In view of limited resources and declining participation, it is essential to keep focused on key issues; to keep aligned with current needs, and to set and follow priorities.

- Dick Black (DOE) noted that there are many areas where we need to work to avoid redundant efforts - there should be a mechanism or process to work together.

- John Ferguson (ASME) noted that the ANSI Standard Management Board was chartered for such a purpose, but is now defunct.

- Mike Mayfield (NRC) queried if NIST might assume such a role, with several individuals stating that it would not be appropriate for NIST.

- Kitty Kono (ASTM) asked if the lack of coordination was a problem, and if so, was it a significant problem.

- Alex Marion (NEI) observed that as the needs of end users of standards evolve with changes in industry, then SDO's then need to adapt in response. It is among the SDOs responsibilities to manage and coordinate such changes.

- John Ferguson (ASME) stated that SDOs should look at the QA standards issues noted by Bud Danielson (DOE), and work to integrate the SDO efforts in nuclear QA.

- Frank Cherny (NRC) indicated that some aspects of high temperature reactors are addressed in the boiler and pressure vessel code in Section II.

- John Ferguson (ASME) reiterated that part of the problem of diminishing participation with SDOs is the lack of participation by younger individuals. This in turn can be linked to the fact that "Codes and Standards" are generally not taught at U.S. colleges and universities. Richard Black (DOE) indicated that this might be an appropriate issue for the Interagency Committee on Standards Policy (ICSP) to address. Rick Serbu (DOE) noted the ongoing effort at Catholic

University (Don Purcell) that provides lecturers from SDOs, government and industry to discuss standards management.

g. Denny Ross, ANS consultant, identified three areas of high priority from the last SDO meeting:

1. The fire PRA standard is in the process of being sponsored by NRC.
2. 2. A Component Reliability Standard was suggested to NRC, but existing programs there have satisfied the perceived need;
3. 3. Several proposals for a PRA standard for the balance of the fuel cycle were mentioned to both NRC and DOE, with no evident interest yet. Further efforts will be made to both NRC and DOE in the future.

Suggestions have been made for standards associated with the advanced design concepts; this effort is just getting started. Although some have the view that it is too soon, in terms of a new order, nonetheless ANS will pursue this possibility, both with NRC and DOE.

Additional areas for standards include license renewal and MOX.

- In follow-up discussions, Don Spellman (ORNL/ANS) asked if "lessons learned" would be appropriate standards material. Mike Mayfield (NRC) noted that there were problems with this, since it is sometimes difficult to establish what constitutes "good" lessons learned, and how they can be acceptably applied generally. It was also noted that the use of lessons learned often raises questions, sometimes more than it provides answers. Additionally, there is no consensus process for developing lessons learned as there is for developing standards, although the NRC and DOE are cooperating on a "lessons learned" documentation and analysis system. Denny Ross (ANS) recognized the difficulties in standardizing "knowledge-based" information. Don Spellman and John Fergusun (ASME) again recognized the need for "greybeards" - individuals experienced in recognizing and bringing forth standards needs, and familiar with standards development processes.

h. Alex Marion (NEI) summarized his previous remarks, noting that standards work should be focused on standards that are needed and used. In order for industry to support international standards efforts, those standards must have value for the industry and not take away from essential, direct support efforts. While industry supports participation with U.S. SDOs, this is done to update and keep current standards that are presently in use, not to produce new standards that are not needed at present. We should continue to support the continuous improvement of existing codes and standards to the extent that there is value in this participation. In response to John Ferguson's query about value, Alex equated value with use of a standard. Alex further noted that Federal agencies mandating the use of voluntary consensus standards was becoming problemmatic, and was not necessary. Gordon Riel (NSWCC/HPSSC) also noted that the VCS process should not lead to use in regulation. It is through participation in creating and developing the VCS that its use and application are influenced, with the intent that it is voluntarily applied.

- John Ferguson noted that the development of the risk-based PRA standard constituted an effort at regulatory redirection - going away from mandating requirements to basing them on risk.

i. Mike Bowers (IEEE) supported the coordination effort between SDO groups. He noted that IEEE implemented electronic balloting about 6 weeks prior to the Coordination meeting. Mike liked the concept of the DOE REVCOM system because of it is basically easy to use. He cited the publication of IEEE 379 as an ongoing activity of interest.

j. Mike Mayfield (NRC Standards Executive) made several key points in his closing remarks: (1) we need to facilitate information sharing and cooperation with and among SDOs; (2) we support the notion of coordination efforts (such as combining the various SDO nuclear QA efforts) to avoid duplication of effort, wasting dwindling resources, and to keep a focus on key areas; (3) it is good to hear of the forward-looking plans and development of vehicles for change stemming from this meeting; (4) the NRC would like to be able to facilitate a prompt response from SDOs for key code cases (e.g., code cases related to Regulatory Guides). The DOE REVCOM system might be something that could be tried. Mike expressed his thanks to all for their attendance and active participation.

k. Dick Black (DOE Standards Executive) discussed some pending changes that may surface with the changes in Congress and Administration. External regulation is apparently again on the agenda of congressional committees. This may once again require the close interaction of DOE and the NRC staff on related issues. Dick summarized that the nuclear safety policy goal for DOE is the convergence on the use of codes and standards. External regulation would provide a legal mandate for the use of NRC standards at DOE facilities. Previous reviews of the relative applicability of DOE versus NRC requirements for DOE facilities have indicated that for DOE missions and functions, DOE standards and requirements are more suitable. The issue of DOE's efforts to implement ISA -Integrated Safety Assessment (where safety is considered as an integral part of design and operations) becomes critical. Safety analysis (where hazards are identified and assessed) serves as a tool, not an endpoint for ISA.

9. NRC/SDO Future Interactions (Richard Black, Michael Mayfield)
Tentative issues identified for possible discussion at the next DOE/NRC/SDO meeting included the following:

- Evaluate interest in Integrated Safety Assessment (ISA) per DOE-STD-3009
- Evaluate coordination with agencies on Software Quality Assurance Standards/IEEE (a DNFSB safety issue with DOE)
- Consider coordinating the efforts SDOs on nuclear QA; find people (in ANS, ASQ, etc; identify common interests and concerns
- Investigate an overlap on "risk-informed" standards - coordinate among SDOs
- Evaluate DOE's efforts with Procedure Systems Standards & IEEE Lessons Learned Standard
- Evaluate interest in coordination with agencies on Maintenance Management

The next meeting DOE/NRC/SDO coordination meeting is tentatively planned for January 2002 at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission facilities in Rockville, MD.

10. Follow-Up Items:

(1) General Coordination among SDOs on cooperation and consolidation of efforts: [Lead: John Ferguson, ASME]

(a) Nuclear Quality Assurance: Coordinate on integrating agency, industry, and SDO nuclear quality assurance efforts: Proceed "offline" in general at first. Then bring in people with common interests and concerns in the various QA areas (e.g., from ANSI, NEI, DOE, NRC). ANS 3.1 group, ASME NQA 1, US TAG ISO TC 176 (ISO 9001)

(b) "Risk-Informed" Overlap: Several SDOs are involved in risk-related standards development efforts. Develop a forum for sharing information on these activities and coordinating efforts where practical.

(2) Bring up the issue of standards as a cirriculum item at U.S. colleges and universities as a policy issue with the Interagency Committee on Standards Policy (ICSP). [Lead: Richard Black, DOE]

ATTACHMENT 2
COORDINATION MEETING - DOE, NRC AND STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 2001
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
FORRESTAL BUILDING, ROOM GH-027
FINAL AGENDA (6/20/01)

Purpose: **Review the status of joint DOE/NRC/SDO standards activities and identify issues and activities for future coordination.**

12:30 - 1:00 p.m. **Security In Processing** at Forrestal Building Visitor's Lobby

1:00 - 1:10 p.m. **Opening Remarks** (Richard Black, DOE Standards Executive, Michael Mayfield, NRC Standards Executive)
- Introduction of Participants

1:10 - 1:25 p.m. **ASTM Administration of ISO TC85 - (**Kitty Kono on behalf of Jeff Adkins)
- Handout on status of ASTM administration of ISO TC85

1:25 - 1:40 p.m. **Lightning Protection Standard Issue** (John Fredlund, DOE/DP-45)
- DOE and Interagency needs for a Lighting Protection Standard and NFPA 780 issues

1:40 - 1:55 p.m. **ANS/ASCE Conversion of DOE Seismic Standards** (Neil W. Brown, DOE/LLNL)
- Status of conversion of DOE seismic technical standards to voluntary consensus standards via ANS/ASCE sponsorship.

1:55 - 2:10 p.m. **DOE Topical Committee Coordination** (Stephen Domotor, DOE/EH-412
- Efforts and Interactions of the DOE Biota Dose Assessment Topical Committee in DOE, Interagency, National and International Forums

2:10 - 2:30 p.m. **Demonstration of DOE REVCOM review and comments system**

2:30 - 2:40 p.m. **Break**

2:40 - 4:10 p.m. **DOE/NRC Standards Needs - Advanced Reactors**

- Pebble Bed Reactor - NRC (15 minutes)
- Gen 4 Reactors - DOE (15 minutes)
- NEI (15 minutes)
- Questions/Discussion of standards required in support of DOE and NRC efforts (45minutes)

4:10- 4:40 p.m. **Status of On-going SDO Efforts** (SDO Representatives)

- "Go-Around" on Needs and priorities; Discussion of standards under development to address emerging issues (ANS, ASME, ASTM, HPS, et al - 5 minutes each)

4:40- 5:00 p.m. **NRC/SDO Future Interactions** (Richard Black, Michael Mayfield)

- Issues for next DOE/NRC/SDO Meeting
  - Software Quality Assurance Standards
  - Procedure Systems Standards & IEEE Lessons Learned Standard
  - Maintenance Management
- Date for next meeting